Learning Through Research in a Professional Development School: A Duoethnographic Approach to Teacher Educator Professional Learning

Amy E. Long, Lock Haven University
Rachel Wolkenhauer, The Pennsylvania State University
Mary Higgins, University of Denver

ABSTRACT: In this article, we share the duoethnographic research of two novice teacher educators who used the process of duoethnography as a form of research-based professional learning within a PDS context to articulate emergent thinking and changes in perceptions about their teacher education practices. Through their research, they discovered the value of exploring and articulating personal narratives while challenging one another to reflect on her practice in deeper ways. The sample duoethnographic dialogue presented in this article demonstrates the ways duoethnography can be used to research teacher educator learning while also serving as a tool for problem-solving the challenges associated with learning to become a teacher educator.

Relevant NAPDS Essentials: 4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants; 5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;

A problematic assumption persists in the field of teacher education. Teacher educators, who carry out complex and multifaceted roles, are assumed to have elusive and "self-evident" jobs (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE], 2018; Cochran-Smith, 2012; Lunenber et al., 2014; Zeichner, 2005, p. 118). Given this assumption, teacher educators are regularly expected to learn on the job, and the apprenticeship model leaves many novice teacher educators underprepared, isolated, and unsupported (Burns & Badiali, 2015; Cuenca, 2013; Loughran, 2011; Murray et al., 2009; Slick, 1998a; Yendol-Hoppey et al., 2019). Although there has been extensive research into the development of teacher candidates and inservice teachers, little scholarship focuses on the preparation and learning of the teacher educators responsible for that development.

If we are to respond to calls from prominent educational organizations for more rigorous clinically based teacher education programs (e.g., AACTE, 2018; Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP], 2013; National Association of Professional Development Schools [NAPDS], n.d.), then we must systematically study the teacher educators who can help transform teacher education. In response, this article reports on a research approach taken by two novice teacher educators in a professional development school (PDS) while taking research courses toward doctoral degrees. The approach, a relatively new form of qualitative research called duoethnography (Norris et al., 2012), has been gaining popularity in educational settings, as it helps to respond to the complexities inherent in the work of educational research (e.g., Higgins et al., 2018; Krammer & Mangiardi, 2012; Seidel & Hill, 2015). The authors thought the process demonstrated promise for both supporting the learning and professional growth of the teacher educators and for researching teacher educator learning in systematic ways (Higgins et al., 2018).

In this article, we share the duoethnographic research of two graduate-student teacher educators who used the process of duoethnography to articulate emergent thinking and changes in perceptions about practices related to their responsibilities supervising teacher candidates in a PDS. PDSs, institutions formed through partnerships between teacher education programs and PK-12 schools (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2001), are argued to provide space for the professional preparation of teacher candidates as well as professional development for school and university-based teacher educators (e.g., mentor teachers, graduate students, and university faculty) (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). While this may be the intent of PDSs, it is rare that teacher educators, who provide professional learning for other PDS partners, receive professional development themselves (Cuenca, 2013; Loughran, 2011; Murray, 2009; Wolkenhauer & Hooser, 2020; Yendol-Hoppey et al., 2019; Zeichner, 2005). Former elementary school teachers who had received little to no formal preparation to become teacher educators, the first and third authors of this paper (Amy and Mary), working with their graduate advisor (Rachel), used duoethnography to support their learning and growth as PDS teacher educators through dialogic storytelling, while simultaneously learning to conduct educational research as Ph.D. students. Through their research, they discovered the value of using research to explore and articulate

personal narratives while challenging one another to reflect on her teacher education practices in deeper ways.

This article begins with an overview of duoethnographic methodology and how the process was utilized in Amy and Mary's work as PDS teacher educators. We then present an excerpt from their duoethnographic journal and discuss implications related to teacher educator learning.

Methodology

Duoethnography (Norris, 2008; Norris et al., 2012) is a "collaborative research methodology in which two or more researchers of difference juxtapose their life histories to provide multiple understandings of the world" (Norris et al., 2012, p. 9). Duoethnographies present two (or more) texts side by side, creating a new hybrid text of alternating alliances, promoting rigorous study as partners reflect on, and (re)conceptualize, their life stories together. This process, in turn, acknowledges the reformation of researcher/educator beliefs, values, and ways of knowing as a result of thinking and writing about research in both participatory and emancipatory ways (Norris & Sawyer, 2015).

Norris et al. (2012) cited nine tenets of duoethnography, in which the approach is:

- life as curriculum
- a form of praxis
- polyvocal and dialogic
- a deliberate juxtaposition that invites readers of the research to add and rethink
- a coexistence of differences articulated alongside one another
- a space where universal truths are not sought.

And where co-researchers:

- form a deep trust
- deliberate with one another
- and expect changes in both of their stories

Duoethnographers use their lived experiences, or currere, to navigate situations and provide context in their research through conversational-style writing that invites both researchers to engage in critical discussions where both of their voices are clear, yet interwoven. The discussions are intended to push researchers to confront and challenge their own experiences, assumptions, and beliefs through engagement in authentic conversation and questioning. Duoethnography requires openness, trust, intentionality, and respect between researchers so that the duoethnographic partners might come to new understandings where universal truth is not sought, but reflective action can be taken.

Context

Amy and Mary's duoethnography emerged from their shared experience as former elementary school teachers coming into a Ph.D. program to study curriculum and instruction. As part of their graduate work, they co-taught methods courses and supervised elementary school teacher candidates as graduate assistants in the PDS partnership between their university and its local school district. With almost no formal preparation for their teacher educator roles, Amy and Mary struggled with supervision in the PDS, and these challenges quickly became regular topics of conversation between these graduate school colleagues. Some of their contention was purely with the act of supervision, such as methods for supervising, expectations of the role, the relationships between mentor teachers and teacher candidates, or teacher candidates' negative responses to their individual, emerging, supervisory styles (Higgins, et al., 2018). Other struggles were related to feeling like outsiders in the PDS partnership (Gardiner & Lorch, 2015). Neither of them had taught K-12 students in this particular state, and they were unfamiliar with the state and school district policies. Further, Amy and Mary did not already have personal relationships with the mentor teachers and other teacher educators within the program, who had all worked with the district for some time. As graduate students, they were grappling to balance their coursework, personal research, and roles as teacher educators. While Amy and Mary were experiencing struggles that each could relate to, they were approaching supervision from very different perspectives—stemming from their own experiences of being supervised and their early careers as classroom teachers—and this could cause tension in their relationship.

Amy had a positive teacher education experience as an undergraduate student, and went into the profession feeling confident in her decision to become a teacher. Amy was a graduate of the same PDS partnership where she was working as a graduate student, and was familiar with the model of clinical teacher education used in the PDS. She took an approach similar to her PDS supervisor in that she felt the supervisor was another teacher in the classroom, there to both support the K-12 students as well as the teacher candidate's growth and development. Amy described her supervisor as "the organic member" (Burns, 2012) because the supervision was embedded into the culture of classroom teaching and learning.

Through this supervision model, Amy (as the student teacher), her supervisor, and her mentor teacher were all equal members of the learning community and took ownership over the students' learning. The positive experience of having a supervisor as a collaborator in teaching was an experience Amy would go on to mimic in her own supervision practices. Inspired by her PDS experience, Amy mentored teacher candidates in her own elementary school classroom and could, therefore, relate to mentors based on those experiences in her new supervision role as a PDS teacher educator. Amy was a classroom teacher for 8 years and then became a pre-kindergarten through sixth grade instructional coach for an additional 4 years. Because of her experiences, particularly her training as an instructional coach, Amy expected to approach supervision as a coaching opportunity and as a partnership between teacher candidate, supervisor, and mentor teacher.

Mary (2/15): Last week, I spoke with a mentor after a school meeting about an intern's midterm assessment. We both agreed that the intern is not going above and beyond. Amy (2/16): What brought you to agree with mentor's side for this? Mary (2/29): I know I shouldn't compare her to other interns, but the effort she puts into writing detailed lesson plans is just not up to par with my other interns. I know they are all at different developmental levels. However, I also notice this in her passion and effort to ask for help. She rarely asks questions and or seeks advice from others. During intern meetings she shares as little as possible. Amy (3/18): I have an intern that does the same thing; she has never said anything at an intern meeting and her lesson plans are only so-so. She does the minimum to get by. I am not sure why, because unlike your intern, she does seem motivated. Mary (2/29): I know from speaking to another supervisor, she made it through multiple intern meetings without saying anything. So, the issue is more than just effort with her classroom responsibilities. She is also not taking advantage of the collaboration and reflective practices provided in the PDS experience. Amy (3/18): I wonder if interns know HOW to collaborate effectively. When I was a new coach, I spent the entire first year building collaborative teams by teaching them how to meaningful collaborate. We addressed the 7 norms of collaboration, establishing working agreements, developing grounding and check-ins, and the use of protocols. Too often I think we assume people have these skills already but they don't. I've been reflecting upon how to build in more collaborative teaching into the work we do with interns. I wonder if that would be well-received? Mary (3/17): I could go on about turning in reflective journals late/incomplete, late lesson plans, and less positive remarks other educators have told me about. I hate being a downer, but she is not fulfilling the expectations of an intern.

Figure 1. Duoethnographic Journal Sample

Note. The sample dated, color-coded text from Amy & Mary's duoethnographic journal is shown in grayscale.

In contrast to Amy's experiences of becoming a teacher, Mary had a difficult teacher education experience. Mary completed a one-semester student teaching field experience in the final semester of her senior year and did not have a positive relationship with her student teaching supervisor. She described her university supervisor as "the monitor" (Burns, 2012). Her supervisor was focused on monitoring and evaluating Mary's instructional practices. Throughout the duoethnography process, she frequently lamented her supervisor being a cold, distant outsider with a bureaucratic supervision style (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007); and therefore, went out of her way to have positive, meaningful relationships with her own supervisees as the "Ms. Congeniality" supervisor (Burns, 2012). In part because of her poor experiences in student teaching, Mary began her career as a Teacher for America educator. She was a classroom teacher for 3 years before beginning graduate studies.

Where Amy looked for opportunities to coach with professional authority, Mary strove to develop personal relationships with interns, and her practices were based on personal authority. Their different stances and approaches to supervision were apparent in their work and occasionally caused discomfort when they collaborated.

Procedures

At the beginning of their PDS work, Amy and Mary were keeping personal-professional journals documenting their experiences as first year teacher educators. After being introduced to duoethnography in Rachel's (their advisor) research seminar, they decided the approach might fit into their emerging journaling habit while facilitating a more productive relationship for themselves, and providing an opportunity to try research together. Their duoethnography began by merging the writing from their two journals into one shared polyvocal journal. While they worked to build up trust, they mostly used the journal to vent concerns and offer one another support. Eventually, they learned to challenge each other, and offer critical guidance. The journal was a shared electronic document where the authors initiated separate entries and inserted comments conversationally. Their journaling was fluid, as they returned to excerpts, adding to them frequently. The text was embedded with both of their voices interwoven and they color-coded and dated entries to keep track of who was writing and when (see Figure 1, Duoethnographic Journal Sample).

In developing their duoethnography, Amy and Mary wrote, talked, and reflected upon the teacher education situations they encountered throughout the school year. Additionally, they found academic literature to inform their research. The literature began to act as a third voice, informing their work with teacher candidates and mentors, as well as with each other and their PDS colleagues (Norris, et al., 2012). The literature added an academic perspective that broadened their views about teacher education, supervision practices, teacher candidates, and clinical field experiences. The literature also complemented their Ph.D. coursework and emerging skills as educational researchers. As the school year began to close, the authors started coding their journal to find common themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). To code, they used the six phases of Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis by: (1) familiarizing themselves with the data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the report, which in this case followed a duoethnographic scripted style.

The thematic analysis helped them reconstruct their joint text based on a process similar to axial coding "whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 96). Through the duoethnography process, various themes emerged both in journaling and through conversations (e.g., feelings of isolation, reflection, balance, relationships). The authors kept a running list of these ideas to use as initial codes. Coding consisted of reading through the polyvocal journals and highlighting areas of the text where the initial codes were evident as well as noting emerging codes. Amy and Mary individually coded the text and then came together to compare their notes. From their analysis, they could synthesize the themes into learning about supervision within a PDS context (e.g., navigating conflict, scaffolding learning for teacher candidates, etc.). True to the methodological approach, restructuring of the duoethnographic text was done in its original conversational style so as to combine the "rationality of the story and the emotion of the interview" (Charmex, in Corbin, 2009, p. 54).

Duoethnographic Findings

By engaging in the process of duoethnography, Amy and Mary found themselves becoming more reflective practitioners as teacher educators with supervision responsibilities, and as researchers. As supervising teacher educators so often work unsupported and in isolation (Slick, 1998b), their collaborative research allowed them the opportunity to reflect on their work, collaborate on tools and strategies to use with teachers and teacher candidates in the PDS, and critique one another in challenging situations. They became stronger in all of their roles (supervising, teaching, and researching), and better managers of their own time and graduate work by holding one another accountable and meeting regularly to deliberate, reflect, and debrief (Higgins et al., 2018). They used their duoethnographic journal as an outlet to log their experiences as well as their learning, and to self-reflect in ways that used currere (Norris & Sawyer, 2015) and pushed them to reason "based on diverse perspectives placed in a broader context" (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Lee, 2005, 2008, p. 121). They were able to provide on-demand and job-embedded coaching through the frequency of their dialogic journaling. Amy and Mary's journal spanned two semesters, nearly the duration of the elementary school year in which they were supervising teacher candidates in their yearlong PDS program.

During the second semester, Amy and Mary found their conversations frequently turning to a developing relationship with one of Mary's teacher candidates and that teacher candidate's mentor teacher. In the PDS program where they worked, this relationship of university supervisor, teacher candidate (or "intern") and mentor teacher is referred to as "the triad." From the beginning of the school year, this teacher candidate, "Jessica," struggled with completing methods assignments and engaging in conversations with others. In particular, she struggled to connect to her mentor teacher, "Dan." Dan often raised concerns about Jessica's lack of initiative in the classroom. Frequently, he asked her, "What are you going to give back to this classroom?" Analysis of the polyvocal journal revealed that this triad's relationship was important for Amy and Mary to deliberate together through duoethnography, because in many ways it caricatured their developing understanding of the complicatedness inherent in the teacher educator role: the invisible belief that one should know how to teach just because they have had experiences in schools, struggling to understand expectations, finding balance, and feeling like an outsider.

Amy and Mary's duoethnographic experience helped them develop a stronger understanding of their roles in this school-university partnership and supervision practices as novice teacher educators. Triads ideally function as teams where all parties collaborate around issues of teaching and learning (Slick, 1998a). Engaging in reflective conversations with one another fosters productive relationships, as interactions are less focused on evaluation, and members of the triad can feel supported in their development as reflective practitioners (Ross, 2002; Stanulis & Russell, 2000). Research demonstrates that teacher educators play a key role in the success of triads (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). Teacher educators act, at times, as facilitators in light of new knowledge related to learning-to-teach, reflective practice, and collaboration.

Naturally, when challenges arise through the learning-to-teach experience, conflicts can develop between mentor teachers and teacher candidates, and it is typically teacher educators who jump in as troubleshooters and negotiators to mediate the situation. In a way, the teacher educator is riding the fence at times between the mentor and teacher candidate and must step in to "weather the storm" (Stanulis & Russell, 2000, p. 76). This was the case for Amy and Mary in learning to supervise within their PDS context. Throughout the year, Mary needed to negotiate a difficult triad relationship and turned to duoethnography for the praxis that came from intentional, deliberative conversations with Amy.

The following text, presented in a scripted duoethnographic style, illustrates this challenge. The excerpt demonstrates how Amy and Mary supported and problematized the contentious relationship between a mentor and teacher candidate (who both consented to being a part of this research) while developing their individual supervision practices, and simultaneously learning to research as curriculum and instruction Ph.D. students. The sample from the duoethnography demonstrates the potential of duoethnography as a way for teacher educators to learn and research within a clinical field experience like those in professional development schools. The episode focuses on self-reflection and making use of one's own life as curriculum (Norris & Sawyer, 2015).

Is this Staying on the Fence?: A Duoethnographic Episode

Mary: It's definitely a struggle with Jessica [teacher candidate] and Dan [mentor teacher]. I feel like both of them are

exaggerating about each other. Dan feels like Jessica isn't putting in the effort to be a successful intern, while Jessica feels that Dan is undermining her ability by changing lesson dates/times and jumping in too quickly to address behavioral issues, etc. I want to advocate for Jessica, but it's getting harder and harder...

Amy: This balance is so difficult, particularly if you personally agree with one side or another (I'm not saying you do in this case, yet often it's a struggle to not agree/disagree!). ...

Amy: After rereading this section a few weeks later, I am wondering: do you feel an urge to "fix"? Remember in [professor's] class, we read that article by Slick (1998a) on graduate students as supervisors? She said "...if problems develop between cooperating teacher and student teacher or if the student teacher has difficulties, the supervisor may feel it is her obligation to be attentive to these concerns and that she is expected 'to fix' matters" (p. 822). I don't know if you do, but I see you feeling this need to be the problem solver and also act like the "glue" to hold the triad together. Is that good for you and/or the triad?

Mary: Yes, I do feel like that, especially as a new supervisor. I do feel like it is my obligation to keep the peace and to make sure that Jessica makes some serious changes. Plus, Dan's had over 20 years of classroom teaching experience and almost a decade in the PDS. I understand his frustration. I'm frustrated too.

Amy: When our coordinator first asked us to "stay on the fence," I wasn't sure I agreed. I have since looked back at Knudson and Turley's article (2000) and, given your situation, think I know more about what [coordinator] means. Knudson and Turley said that, "university supervisors are the watchdogs for completing student teaching, facilitators of relationships among participants, and confidantes of anyone in the triad who chooses to confide" (p. 185). It seems [our coordinator] is encouraging you to stay on the fence in this same way. And it feels like both Dan and Jessica want to see you on their own "side".

Mary: I do feel like I have been protecting Jessica. Maybe a tad too much. I am trying very hard to stay on the fence like [coordinator] recommended, but then things like this happen that make me question myself: Dan ended our meeting this week by saying that he always feels like the bad cop. He asked if I would send an email to him and Jessica saying that I requested to meet with Dan and that after asking Dan some questions, his observations confirmed some of the concerns I was noticing. ...And then I realized that Jessica is more often consulting with me, and not with Dan. I definitely feel that she is more willing to share her thoughts with me. This week in her written reflection, she expressed her frustrations with Dan and his "go with the flow" mentality. However, after observing in another teacher's room and having a conversation about different teaching styles, she said that she felt motivated again. This is getting so complicated! I'm not sure I know how to stay on the fence, or what that is supposed to mean right now.

Amy: It's important to not place all the blame on Jessica - or yourself! - but to consider what everyone in the triad might do differently. We know that frequently student teachers come into teaching with an idea of what it should look like and are unwilling to change their approach to teaching (Knudson & Turley, 2000). Jessica seems to disagree with Dan's style. What's motivating her? Does she see ways that she might be at fault rather than pinning all the blame on her mentor? How might thinking through those things together help us figure out how to supervise?!

Mary: I do think Jessica is starting to realize that we are both on her side. She actually smiled this morning, but then she held back tears, and it was clear that she was about to break down. I ended the conversation saying that I would continue advocating for her, but that I needed her help. I said that I can only do so much. Jessica does need to jump in and be willing to take more risks in her internship. I do want to be careful to not place all responsibility for improvements on Jessica. I'm figuring out that Dan and I are going to need to work on scaffolding support.

Mary: So... now Dan spoke with me about his own insecurities... He was looking for reassurance that he was doing everything he could and that it was not his fault that Jessica is at risk [to fail] on the midterm evaluation. What?!

Amy: I think you bring up one of the most challenging parts of our work- how can we support both parties but also empower the interns to advocate for themselves? I am thinking about how to make my time with my teacher candidates more meaningful by supporting both them and their mentors, and how to keep myself from feeling so burnt out and rather useless while I am in their rooms. What can I be doing that will either impact the teaching and learning of the children, or the growth of the intern and mentor? I am not facing a particularly challenging triad as you are, yet, I still want to know that I am supporting and advocating for all the interns - your situation with Jessica and Dan is reinforcing the deficits I am feeling with supervising my own interns. Of course, as a former instructional coach, I think coaching is the answer. ☺ I love coaching and yet I haven't done it at all since I've started my role as a supervisor. Why

haven't I?! I need to be more thoughtful about bringing what I know is good professional learning for educators into the work that I am doing. I feel so frazzled day to day; I need to move past simply showing up and putting in the time to engage in meaningful work with both teachers and interns. How was your evaluation meeting with Jessica and Dan?

Mary: Tell me more about your coaching strategies and how you would hope to use them with interns! Let's use some of our duoethnography time to figure that out. The midterm meeting didn't go well...Jessica broke down and I left the meeting feeling uncomfortable. I was upset that Jessica wasn't comfortable enough to speak about her emotions. We just sat there and listed off all the things Jessica needed to do. Unconsciously we may have been protecting our own emotions and positions in the triad rather than doing what Stanulis and Russell (2008) urge mentors and university supervisors to do - expose our vulnerabilities and take on "mutual mentoring" where all members of the triad feel valued and equal. I am not sure we accomplished this! (I'm not sure I know how!) We had good intentions, but I think we ended up handling the situation inappropriately to make sure that Jessica felt encouraged and supported. Dan often takes over the conversation. I do feel that Dan limits Jessica's ability to share when he takes all of the air time. She needs a space to share her reflections. Even though Jessica was present at this meeting - and our other triad meetings - I often feel that Jessica's voice is missing. Now I'm really reflecting on how to adjust my supervision so that Jessica's voice is more present.

Amy: I completely understand why you would leave that meeting feeling unsettled! It can be challenging to make sure the teacher candidate's voice is heard, yet, that is so critical since all of this work in teacher education is to help THEM develop into teachers. The story about your meeting reminded me: recently, I became really frustrated during a teacher candidate meeting because, rather than let them talk and share their concerns, another teacher educator rattled on forever - I kept interrupting her and saying things to the interns such as, "Well, what questions do you guys have?" but then the teacher educator would just pick up again. Luckily, she realized it, though, because twice since she mentioned how she talked too much. I think I will email her and just reinforce that the meetings should belong to the interns and that we need to minimize the time that our voices are in the conversation. I am learning how to manage interactions with other teacher educators as well as with our interns. That said, I think you can - and need to - brainstorm with Dan ways to make Jessica's voice more prevalent in your triad.

Mary: After reading about the intervention that a university supervisor used to "save" a relationship between a mentor and student teacher (Stanulis & Russell, 2000), I think we could have handled our [midterm evaluation] meeting differently. Placing blame on others frequently occurred during this meeting. Instead I wish we would have considered "how we could respond more openly to the others" (p. 73). Even though conversation protocols sometimes drive me nuts, I think one would have been helpful here. Stanulis and Russell (2000) use one where both the mentor and student teacher start by sharing the most important item they want the other to hear. Then, the listener repeats what they heard and any misunderstanding they may have (Higgins, et al., 2018). At the beginning [of the meeting], Jessica said that she never knew that she was doing poorly as a teacher candidate. Students want to know how well they do (good or bad), we have not provided her with that. Instead, we are pushing her to self-reflect on her performance. This is pushing Jessica out of her comfort zone and how she has moved through school in the past.

This quote from Talvaitie, et al. (2000) resonates with Jessica's story and I appreciate how it helps me think about supervision. I hope the end is true for our story too.

> They felt that the cooperating teachers did not invest enough time and interest in guiding them. In reality, the cooperating teachers in the programme also have to cope with everyday tasks of their own at school, and they have indicated that they have enough problems with their own pupils. Student teachers' perceptions of their role vis-a-vis their university supervisors seemed to start out egocentrically, but later on their relationships with their supervisors changed to reflect the student teacher's growing confidence (p. 86).

Amy: I am glad you found this connection and I DO hope your triad gets there. I can see where interns start out egocentric and then show promise to flourish. This is often how we see student teachers develop with many of their relationships (students, colleagues, parents of students); they focus so much on themselves and what they are doing and, as they gain more confidence in their teaching, blossom and expand their relationships with others. As they develop their teacher identity, they are better able to recognize strengths and weaknesses in their own teaching. As you said, Jessica didn't know she was doing poorly. Now that everything is on the table, it's time to help her improve and grow her confidence. This is one way our supervisor role can shift to "teacher"- as the supervisor, you can support her professional growth by helping her learn strategies to

> improve her teaching performance. As novice teacher educators, these moments can help us develop our own repertoire of strategies to use with teacher candidates. Also, I think we are learning more and seeing firsthand how interns develop over the course of the school year - I know that has definitely been a learning experience for me.

Conclusion

In this sample episode, we witness Amy and Mary taking a duoethnographic approach to understanding their roles in PDS triads as teacher educators. While they had strategies from teaching and coaching, they often found themselves at a loss in regards to their position in the triad. Analyses of this episode reveal how similarly Jessica was experiencing her internship to the ways Amy and Mary were experiencing their first year as teacher educators. The episode is significant in the role it played for the authors to take research-based action grounded in shared reflection. They learned a great deal about themselves by so closely studying the challenging experiences of Jessica. They were able to question and change their practices by looking at the broader picture through the experiences of one another and the literature as their third voice.

Many teacher educators are thrown into their roles with an expectation that they will perform well since they attended school and (many) taught in classrooms as teachers (Slick, 1998a; Zeichner, 2005). Little regard is paid for the new complexity and content of the role (e.g., working with adult learners, teaching and designing college courses, supervising field experiences, researching, writing and presenting, navigating school district and college social and political dynamics, etc.) (Cochran-Smith, 2012). We see in the sample episode that Mary's colleagues expected her to troubleshoot and problem solve within the triad relationship in ways she couldn't quite grasp. She was unsure of her own role, unsure of practices and policies in the long-standing PDS partnership, and unsure of when and how she might push back against the suggestions of others, most notably Dan and the PDS coordinator.

Interestingly, similar to the teacher educators who undergo the myth of apprenticeship, Jessica's mentor expected things of her that were not communicated or explicitly addressed. After 20 years of mentoring PDS teacher candidates, the skills and responsibilities expected of interns were being taken for granted. Mary was new to the PDS and working with teacher candidates, so the expectations of the mentor teacher were also lost on her, making communication in the triad difficult and strained. Through the duoethnographic process, Mary recognized that telling Jessica to "reflect" without direction on her role as a teacher candidate had been counterproductive. How was Jessica to know if she was doing well, when she didn't know what doing well was supposed to look and feel like? Mary, on the other hand, had space to deliberate with Amy and the literature in their duoethnography in order to begin moving reflection to praxis. In the sample episode, for instance, we see Mary use a conversation protocol (Stanulis & Russell, 2000) during a triad meeting. Mary was able to help her triad communicate expectations more clearly so that they could begin to work through misunderstandings and unfair assumptions.

The work of teacher educators can be emotionally tolling and isolating (Slick, 1998a, 1998b). In this episode, we see Amy's struggle to find balance and purpose in her work paralleled in Jessica's experience. While Jessica is unsure if she agrees with her mentor's teaching style, but feels she has to go along with it, Amy feels she has lost sight of her own teaching style (related to instructional coaching) when doing the work of teacher education. The feeling of lost identity then leads to common imposter syndromes and feelings of inadequacy and isolation (Clance, 1985; Gardiner & Lorch, 2015; Sims & Cassidy, 2019). This duoethnographic episode highlights the ways Mary struggles to support Jessica's emotions. Amy instinctively turns to coaching strategies (e.g., questioning, paraphrasing, discussion protocols, etc.) to help Mary deliberate on the issue at hand. As this happens, Amy realizes that she is not using coaching strategies in her role as a teacher educator, and the duoethnography gives her the space to critically self-reflect and discuss this revelation with Mary. Toward the end of the episode, we see Amy feeling ready to communicate her own expectations for intern meetings to a more senior teacher educator on her PDS team because she has reconnected with her confidence from coaching and plans to use a common coaching strategy in the interaction—reinforcing.

This sample episode from Amy and Mary's duoethnographic journal illustrates how teacher educators can find comfort and motivation to take research-based action grounded in shared reflections by contrasting lived experiences. Using duoethnography to collaborate and problem solve through research, Amy and Mary were able to reflect more deeply on the conflicts they felt in their new roles while using academic literature to support their actions. By engaging in duoethnography, they found that having a colleague acting as a critical friend was imperative for their professional growth as new teacher educators. By openly reflecting on the issues they grappled with as teacher educators within a PDS, such as the difficult triad relationship and loss of teaching identity shared in this article's episode, they were able to improve their own teacher education practices and engage in the educational research expected of them as Ph.D. students. In polyvocal journal entries toward the end of the year the authors reflected:

> Mary: I tried my very best to help Jessica understand the complexities of teaching and learning by questioning and encouraging her. I believe this duoethnography has helped me reflect and be more conscious of the collaboration between this triad. Dan and I need to continue demonstrating best teaching practices, provide hints and guidance as Jessica develops lesson plans, and offer explanations as Jessica reflects on her daily instruction. Through the construct of mutual

mentorship, we are all learning in our various roles and we all have something to bring to the triad. As the teacher educator it is my role to not only stay on the fence between the mentor and the intern, but to also provide encouragement for both the mentor and intern to participate in a collaborative partnership with me (Higgins, et al., 2018).

Amy: I agree that this duoethnographic work is helping both of us reflect on our teacher education practice (Higgins, et al., 2018). Our collaboration helped us to become more reflective. . .we both were able to try new strategies to help our interns develop into the reflective practitioners. Further, I think this work has helped us take one step closer to determining the kind of teacher educators we want to be and made us more intentional in our actions as teacher educators.

Implications

Burns and Badiali (2015) suggest that learning for teacher educators "be ongoing, continuous and part of the continuum of lifelong learning" (p. 434). This paper has implications for typical gaps in teacher educator learning (Loughran, 2011; Murray et al., 2009; Slick, 1998a; Yendol-Hoppey et al., 2019) and illustrates one way duoethnography can be used for teacher educators' continuous professional learning, specifically related to reflection, critical support, and responsive problem solving. Additionally, it demonstrates a promising approach for raising the next generation of educational researchers. Using duoethnography as both a research methodology and a tool for reflective problem solving, we see from this research that the approach demonstrates possibility in disrupting individual narratives so that teacher educators can develop deeper understandings of the field of teacher education and also their own identities as emerging teacher educators and researchers.

The National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) provides nine essentials to describe professional development school partnerships (National Association of Professional Development Schools, n.d.). As a reflective methodology, duoethnography weaves into the NAPDS 9 essentials. Specifically, Essential 4 (a shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants) and Essential 5 (engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants) are seen through Amy and Mary's duoethnographic experience. Furthermore, Darling-Hammond et al. (1995) describe PDS partnerships as a space for the learning of prospective and experienced teachers. The collaborative research approach adds space for university-based teacher educators to deliberate their own practice, while partnering with the integrated work of K-12 schools and colleges of education.

By focusing on their lived experiences through praxis and having more than one voice to juxtapose the experience of becoming teacher educators, Amy and Mary were better able to articulate and discuss their new roles while simultaneously conversing with the theory that they were learning in graduate school. As novice teacher educators, they engaged in the duoethnography process to facilitate the professional learning experiences of themselves and others (Glickman et al., 2001). The episode shared in this article illustrates the ways the authors found critical support through the duoethnography process, which allowed them to better negotiate their roles as teacher educators because of a renewed sense of professionalism in being able to navigate the work together through rigorous, research-based professional learning.

Amy and Mary's duoethnography is an example of the ways a systematic creation of practice data and shared analysis can lead to an increased repertoire for problem solving and being responsive to the work of teacher education. It serves as an illustration for one of the ways teacher educators can be professionally supported in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Through their duoethnography, the authors have (re)conceptualized teacher education as a collaborative, reflective, action-oriented learning experience. We see from this experience that duoethnography should be explored as a way to support beginning teacher educators' professional learning. SUP

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. SAGE.

American Association of College for Teacher Education [AACTE]. (2018). *A pivot towards clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation: A report of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission*.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Burns, R. W. (2012). *Conceptualizing supervision in the professional development school context: A case analysis*. (Publication No. 3521178). [Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Burns, R., & Badiali, B. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher candidates' perceptions of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437.

Corbin, J. (2009). Taking an analytic journey. In J. M. Morse, P. N. Stern, J. Corbin, B. Bowers, K. Charmaz, & A. E. Clarke. (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory: The second generation* (pp. 35-54). Left Coast Press.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP]. (2013). *CAEP accreditation standards*.

Clance, P. R. (1985). *The impostor phenomenon: Overcoming the fear that haunts your success*. Peachtree.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2012). Composing a research life. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(2), 99–110.

Cuenca, A. (2013). Introduction: The complex and undervalued work of university supervisors. In A. Cuenca (Ed.), *Supervising student teachers: Issues, perspectives and future directions*. (pp. v11-xvi). Springer.

Darling-Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M. L., & Cobb, V. L. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*, 87-106.

Gardiner, W. & Lorch, J. (2015). From "outsider" to "bridge": The changing role of university supervision in an urban teacher residency program. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(2), 172-189.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Pearson.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(1), 33–49.

Higgins, M., Morton, A. E., & Wolkenhauer, R. (2018). (Re)conceptualizing preservice teacher supervision through duoethnography: Reflecting, supporting, and collaborating with and for each other. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 69*, 75-84.

Knudson, R. & Turley, S. (2000). University supervisors and at-risk student teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 33*(3), 175-186.

Krammer, D. & Mangiardi, R. (2012). The hidden curriculum of schooling: A duoethnographic exploration of what schools teach us about schooling. In. J. Norris, R. D. Sawyer, & D. Lund, (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 41-70). Left Coast Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lee, H. J. (2005). Understanding and assessing preservice teachers' reflective thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(6), 699–715.

Lee, I. (2008). Fostering preservice reflection through response journals. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(1), 117–139.

Loughran, J. (2011). On becoming a teacher educator. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(3), 279–291.

Lunenber, M., Dengerink, J., & Korthagen, F. (2014). *The professional teacher educator: Roles, behaviour, and professional development of teacher educators*. Sense Publications.

Murray, J., Swennen, A., & Shagir, L. (2009). Understanding teacher educators' work and identities. In A. Swennen, & M. Van der Klink (Eds.), *Becoming a teacher educator: Theory and practice for teacher educators* (pp. 29–43). Springer.

National Association of Professional Development Schools [NAPDS]. (2008). *9 Essentials*. Author. https://napds.org/nine-essentials/

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2001). *Standards for Professional Development Schools*.

Norris, J. (2008). Duoethnography. In L. K. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 233-236). SAGE.

Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. D. (2015). Duoethnography: A retrospective 10 years after. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 8*(1), 1-4.

Norris, J., Sawyer, R., & Lund, D. E. (2012). *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research*. Left Coast Press.

Ross, D. L., (2002). Cooperating teachers facilitating reflective practice for student teachers in a professional development school. *Education, 122*(4), 682-687.

Seidel, J., & Hill, L. (2015). Thinking together: A duoethnographic inquiry into the implementation of a field experience curriculum. *In Education, 21*(2), 49-64.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th Ed.). McGraw Hill.

Sims, W., & Cassidy, J. W. (2019). Impostor phenomenon responses of early career music education faculty. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 67*(1), 45-61.

Slick, S. (1998a). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(8), 821-834.

Slick, S. K. (1998b). A university supervisor negotiates territory and status. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(4), 306-316.

Stanulis, R. N., & Russell, D. (2000). "Jumping in": Trust and communication in mentoring student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*, 65-80.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. SAGE.

Talvitie, U., Peltokallio, L., & Mannisto, P. (2000). Student teachers' views about their relationships with university supervisors, cooperating teachers and peer student teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 44*(1), 79-88.

Wolkenhauer, R., & Hooser, A. (in press). Becoming clinically grounded teacher educators: Inquiry communities in clinical teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120915865.

Yendol-Hoppey, D., Dana, N. F., & Hoppey, D. (Eds.) (2019). *Preparing the next generation of teacher educators for clinical practice*. Information Age Publishing.

Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoming a teacher educator: A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(2), 117-124.

❖ ❖ ❖

Amy E. Long: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0360-4198

Rachel Wolkenhauer: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4713-9723

Mary Higgins: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1258-0295

Dr. Amy Long is an Assistant Professor and the Director of Student Teaching and Field Experiences in the Department of Prek-Grade 8 Education and Professional Studies at Lock Haven University.

Dr. Rachel Wolkenhauer is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction: Curriculum and Supervision at Penn State University.

Dr. Mary Higgins is the Practicum and Internship Coordinator for the Master of Arts in School Counseling and Master of Library & Information Science programs in the Morgridge College of Education at the University of Denver.